

Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are pending in this application.
Claims 16-17 are currently canceled.

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8 and 11-14 is noted with appreciation. All claims are now believed to be placed in condition for allowance.

Priority

It is stated that acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in India. It is noted that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 621/CAL/02 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Please note that this application is a national phase of a PCT application. All relevant documents, including the certified copy of the priority document should have been communicated by the International Bureau to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office. Therefore, a certified copy of priority document should not be required.

However, the Applicant is concurrently making progress to determine why the certified copy of the priority document has not been provided by the International Bureau to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office.

The Applicant will make corrective attempts and keep the Examiner informed as soon as a final resolution is known.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1-4, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wampler (U.S. Patent No. 4,494,753) in view of Stafford (U.S. Patent No. 3,787,054).

This rejection is traversed and continues to be traversed for reasons clearly stated in the Communication filed on December 5, 2006. While the Applicant appreciates the more detailed explanation given by the Office, the rationale apparently is based on hindsight rather than foresight combination of the references.

Upon reliance upon the Office indication that claims 8 and 11-14 contain allowable subject matter and "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims", the subject matter of 12 is incorporated into independent claim 1.

By so amending, independent claim 1 is placed in condition for allowance. All claims dependent thereon, by virtue of inherency, are also placed in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wampler and Stafford as applied above further

in view of Fly (U.S. Patent No. 2,509,340).

This rejection is traversed and continues to be traversed for reasons clearly stated in the Communication filed on December 5, 2006. While the Applicant appreciates the more detailed explanation given by the Office, the rationale apparently is based on hindsight rather than foresight combination of the references.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Wampler in view of Stafford, all claims dependent thereon, by virtue of inherency, are also patentably distinguished over Wampler and Stafford further in view of whatever other secondary reference.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Wampler and Stafford as applied above in view of Reiner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,008,895).

This rejection is traversed and continues to be traversed for reasons clearly stated in the Communication filed on December 5, 2006. While the Applicant appreciates the more detailed explanation given by the Office, the rationale apparently is based on hindsight rather than foresight combination of the

references.

Claim 17 is currently canceled herewith thus conclusively rendering any rejection made thereto moot.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Wampler in view of Stafford, all claims dependent thereon, by virtue of inherency, are also patentably distinguished over Wampler and Stafford further in view of whatever other secondary reference.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claim 16 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplication of claim 12. As clearly explained in the Communication filed on December 5, 2006, in reliance upon the Office indicated allowable subject matter, a new claim 16 was derived by incorporating the subject matter of claims 1 and 12. Therefore, the Office should have indicated claim 16 allowable. In the previous and the current Office action, the Office has merely indicated allowance subject matter, not allowed subject matter; therefore, the objection made to claim 16 based on double patenting is improper. As claim 16 is concurrently cancelled herewith, any objection asserted thereto is conclusively rendered moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are
respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present invention is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is requested to contact the Undersigned Attorney if a Notice of Allowance will not be issued to this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment of fees in connection with this communication to Deposit Account Number 502840.

Respectfully submitted,
Lau & Associates, LLC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael Lau". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the left.

Michael N. Lau
(Registration No. 39,479)
Customer Number 46064
703-637-0488 (Phone)
703-644-4303 (Fax)
IP-LAW@MICHAELNLAU.COM
WWW.MICHAELNLAU.COM